

## **Appendix H**

Summary of 10/8/98 SDWA *Ad Hoc*  
Advisory Council Meeting

**SDWA *Ad Hoc* Advisory Council Meeting Summary**  
**October 8, 1998, Room 717 GEF 2, building 101 S. Webster St. Madison**

Attending: Don Swailes (Dept. of Natural Resources [DNR]), Ross Kinzler (WI Manufactured Housing Assoc.), John Robinson (WI Water Well Assoc.), Darryll Farmer (Eau Claire City/County Health Department), Russhawn Jackson for Henry Anderson (Dept. of Health and Family Services), Jeffrey Sanders (Oneida Nation), Eric Uram (Sierra Club), Barney Bernander (Wisconsin Association of Campgrounds), Scott Giese for Ken Blomberg (WI Rural Water Assoc.), Lawrie Kobza (Municipal Environmental Group), Mike Clark (American Water Works Assoc./ Cudahy Water Utility), Mike Lemcke (DNR), and Jeff Helmuth (DNR).

Introductions were made. Several non-Council members in attendance were invited to the meeting by Jeff Helmuth to participate in the Source Water Assessment Program (SWAP) development. Don Swailes welcomed the Council and other participants and gave brief updates on Capacity Development, Operator Certification, State Revolving Fund Loan Program, Consumer Confidence Reports, Enhanced Surface Water Treatment Rule, Disinfection By-products Rule, Corrections, and Lab Issues. Please contact Don Swailes (608-266-7093) for information on these issues.

Jeff Helmuth gave a short overview of the timeline and program development process that the DNR had gone through so far to develop the SWAP plan and questions on key issues for the Ad Hoc Council. A document "Key Issues for Input on Wisconsin's Source Water Assessment Program" had been sent to all attendees for review prior to the meeting. Jeff asked for responses to the following questions asked in the "Key Issues" document and for other comments on SWAP topics:

**Potential Contaminant Source Inventories**

**Question 1: Are there contaminants that are not currently regulated by EPA that should be part of the state's SWAP program?**

Mike Clark asked if methyl-tert-butyl-ether (MTBE) was considered in the development of the list of potential contaminants. Jeff Helmuth said that since MTBE was a component of gasoline it would be present in the same potential sources as gasoline (i.e. gas service stations and fuel storage tanks). Mike Lemcke added that the DNR was aware of the problems with MTBE and its threat to drinking water.

**Question 2: Are there potential sources of contaminants not listed in the Public Water Supply Contaminant Use Inventory Form 3300-215 that should be included in the SWAP?**

Jeff Helmuth and Mike Lemcke noted that the title of the Public Water Supply Contaminant Use Inventory Form would be changed to "Public Water Supply Potential Contaminant Use Inventory Form" (Form 3300-215) to acknowledge that not all items listed were contaminants (i.e. water wells). Darryll Farmer and John Robinson asked for clarification on whether wellhead protection delineations would be used for contaminant inventories for vulnerability assessments and source water assessments. Jeff and Mike explained that delineations provided by systems in wellhead protection plans would be used as source water areas to be inventoried.

Jeff Sanders asked if non-metallic mining sites would be identified as potential sources of contamination for groundwater systems. Although mining was listed on Form 3300-215 the specific contaminants listed on the form's explanation sheet were limited to those from metallic mining. Jeff Helmuth said that there was not a consensus on whether non-metallic mining sites should be identified. Currently there is not an accurate count of the sites but they probably number around 2100 statewide. It may not be cost-efficient to identify all such sites in source water areas. Jeff Saunders said that in the Oneida Reservation there were 21

aggregate quarries and that a study had determined that there were significant bedrock fissures created from blasting and that dewatering also affected local groundwater quality. Contaminants from quarries include anything that could be deposited in them from the mining operation or that found their way in later. Jeff Helmuth agreed that there were serious concerns related to non-metallic mining in some areas and said that specific contaminants from non-metallic mining could be listed on the explanation sheet.

John Robinson suggested using the high priority list of Leaking Underground Storage Tanks with use restrictions in place.

**Question 3: Do you agree with the State's revised approach to doing contaminant inventories for surface water systems? If not what are your suggestions?**

Lawrie Kobza showed concern over funding the proposed statewide data layers with drinking water money. Jeff Helmuth clarified that the statewide layers would be done only in cooperation with other programs. SWAP money alone would not support statewide data collection. All of the potential sources of contamination targeted for statewide coverage are already targeted by other programs for data collection. The Drinking Water and Groundwater program will leverage efforts from other programs to cover areas within source water protection areas. There was support from the Council for the approach of working cooperatively with other programs to collect statewide data layers of selected potential contaminant sources.

There was a consensus that the proposed potential contaminant source inventory strategy was appropriate.

**Resource Characterization - Groundwater Systems**

**Question 4: Do you agree with the resource characterization strategy proposed for groundwater systems? If not what suggestions do you have?**

There was a consensus that the proposed resource characterization strategy for groundwater systems was appropriate.

**Resource Characterization - Surface Water Systems**

**Question 5: Do you agree with the resource characterization strategy proposed for surface water systems? If not what suggestions do you have?**

There was a consensus that the proposed resource characterization strategy for surface water systems was appropriate. Eric Uram suggested using information available in the Total Daily Maximum Load program. Jeff Sanders suggested contacting Jim Baumann and using information from the Unified Watershed Approach. Jeff Helmuth said that the TMDL Water body list would be used and that Jim Baumann was on the Source Water Protection Team.

**Susceptibility Analysis - Groundwater Systems**

**Question 6: Do you agree with the definitions and susceptibility analysis strategy proposed for groundwater systems? If not what suggestions do you have?**

There was a general support for the definitions of susceptibility, sensitivity, and well vulnerability and the susceptibility analysis strategy proposed for groundwater systems. Darryll Farmer added that he would like to see local expertise and knowledge incorporated into the SWAP and that the DNR should coordinate with local government staff, especially for transient non-community systems. Mike Lemcke said that he was working with the Drinking Water and Groundwater Regional Experts to seek the best sources of local input.

Darryll asked that the finished assessments be made available to local governments. Jeff Helmuth said that they would be available to local governments in paper form and on the world wide web.

### **Susceptibility Analysis - Surface Water Systems**

**Question 7: Do you agree with the susceptibility analysis strategy proposed for surface water systems? If not what suggestions do you have?**

There was a consensus that the susceptibility analysis strategy proposed for surface water systems was appropriate.

**Question 8: Has the State done an initial review of all data sources available and determined the scope of the need for additional information?**

The Council agreed that the State had done an initial review of all data sources available and had determined the scope of the need for additional information.

### **Boundary Water, Multi-State Rivers, and the Great Lakes**

**Question 9: Is this an acceptable approach to gaining information for more complete and consistent source water assessments?**

There was a consensus that the proposed approach of sharing any information relevant to source water assessments with other states, federal facilities, and tribes that request it for the purpose of doing assessments.

**Question 10: Should the state do more to promote contingency plans for public water systems?**

The Council agreed with the DNR's support of the use of Wisconsin Rural Water Association's contingency plan materials and efforts to identify model contingency plans for use by communities. There was a consensus that this was sufficient.

**Question 11: Should the state request that the EPA coordinate/facilitate discussions on these assessments?**

There was a consensus that the proposed approach to coordinating assessments with other states was appropriate. There was no support for requesting EPA to coordinate/facilitate discussions on these assessments.

### **Making the Results of the Assessments Available to the Public**

**Question 12: Do you agree with the proposed strategy for making the results of the assessments available to the public?**

There was a consensus that the proposed approach to making the results of the assessments available to the public was appropriate. Darryll Farmer suggested sending the finished assessments to state and local regulating and inspecting agencies. Jeff Helmuth agreed to facilitate the provision of assessment results to regulating and inspecting agencies

### **State Program Implementation**

**Question 13: Is the preceding timetable an acceptable plan for implementing the SWAP? If not what suggestions do you have?**

There was a consensus that the proposed timeline was aggressive and acceptable. Ross Kinzler suggested adding rule deadlines for other Safe Drinking Water Act programs.

**Question 14: Do you agree with this plan for reporting to the EPA regarding SWAP implementation? If not what suggestions do you have?**

There was agreement that the proposed plan for reporting to EPA was appropriate. Additionally, John Robinson suggested that the Ad Hoc Council meet on a semi-annual basis while needed to receive updates on SWAP implementation.

**Question 15: Are there other ways that the state agencies should coordinate with each other and with other state, federal, and local stakeholders when implementing SWAPs?**

Darryll Farmer suggested that there should be a public meeting on the SWAP in the Western part of the State. Jeff Helmuth said that he would schedule a public meeting in the Western part of the State.

**Question 16 : Should the state update the assessments as much as possible on the 3-year vulnerability assessment schedule or should a new system or timeframe be established?**

There was agreement that, after completion of the SWAP, the assessments should be updated on the 3-year vulnerability assessment schedule as much as resources allow.

**Wrap up**

Jeff Helmuth and Mike Lemcke proposed that the SWAP funding should offer cost-sharing or entirely funding well abandonment in groundwater source protection areas. There was a consensus that this would be a good use of SWAP funds. Jeff Sanders suggested working with counties to promote well abandonment.

Jeff thanked the participants for attending and proposed having a meeting for comments on the draft SWAP plan sometime in December. There was a consensus that the plan should be sent out by mail first and a meeting should be held only if members felt it was necessary. Jeff said he would send out the draft SWAP plan for review around the first of December.

The meeting adjourned at 12:00 noon.

C:\helmuj\swap\appendices\Appendix H.doc